



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJAST_18249
Title of the Manuscript:	Determination of Antioxidants and Total Phenolic Content in Some Wild Vegetables Used Widely in Lesotho
Type of the Article	Short Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reference [1] has been overused. There are several works on this topic which could be added to this work to bring out its purpose clearly. References in the text do not match the references listed. Make more comparisons of your results with other literature/ similar works so we can detect the trend for future works.	This was the problem of formatting the manuscript on the side of the journal since the original document still looks fine. However the references have been fixed appropriately. This is responded to as in the above comment. This is too open, hence the authors decided to leave this comment. The reviewer does not specify the number of comparisons that have to be made. The study already compares every set of results with literature. Carrying out more comparison would end up drifting this more towards a review.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 154 to 155 Quote reference by which your results findings agree with.	This is already discussed above. The authors are reluctant to do excessive comparison lest the manuscript sounds like a "review" rather than a "original research" article.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		